DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 327 SP 008 489

TITLE Teacher Preparation Evaluation Program (TPEP). AACTE Leadership Training on PBTE. Abstract.
INSTITUTION Western Kentucky Univ., Bowling Green.
NOTE 6p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Evaluation; *Evaluation; Followup Studies; *Models; *Student Teachers; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The background of this abstract is the involvement of Western Kentucky University in an evaluative study designed to determine the feasibility of implementing a model such as the one described in Sandefur's "An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates." The purposes of the study are as follows: (a) to aid faculty and administrators concerned with teacher preparation in making decisions pertaining to curriculum evaluation and development and (b) to test the feasibility of conducting the evaluation model with the scope and complexity as suggested. Selected student teachers were analyzed and observed by means of specific measurement instruments. The abstract describes the methods and procedures of the study including the preplanning phases, the selection of subjects, instruments used, the training of observers, the collection of data, and data analysis. (JA)

ED 097327

ABSTRACT

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

TEACHER PREPARATION EVALUATION PROGRAM
(TPEP)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AACTE

LEADERSHIP TRAINING ON PBTE

Introduction

There is growing agreement among educational researchers, professional educators, and members from the lay community that teacher preparation programs in our colleges and universities be continually evaluated and pertinent research be conducted to ensure the continued improvement of teacher competency. Questions are being asked that will require institutions of higher learning to assess their teacher preparation programs, especially in terms of their product - the teacher.

This problem has been emphasized in the Recommended Standards for Teacher Education. Standard 5.1 states, "The institution conducts a well-defined plan for evaluating the teachers it prepares." With the fulfillment of this standard in mind Sandefur authored a monograph entitled An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates.[1] This model has provided a systematic approach to the evaluation of teacher education programs that allows for the improvement of such programs and that meets the spirit intended by Standard 5.1 of the Recommended Standards.

Through extensive review of related research three generalizations as to what constitutes good teaching and a good teacher emerged. These major generalizations were:

1. Good teaching utilizes maximal involvement of the student in direct experiential situations.
2. Good teaching encourages maximal "freedom" for the student.
3. Good teachers tend to exhibit identifiable personal traits broadly characterized by warmth, a democratic attitude, affective awareness, and a personal concern for students.

Evaluative instruments were recommended by Sandefur on the basis of their proven worth as research tools and how well they related to the afore mentioned generalizations.

Sandefur further suggested that teacher preparation programs be evaluated by observable evidence obtained from practicing teachers. This evaluation should start while the teachers are still in the preparation program and continue into the field.

Western Kentucky University is engaged in an evaluative study designed to determine the feasibility of implementing such a model. The initial phase in the preparation program is concentrated on the student teaching experience (Phase 1) and with subsequent phases dealing with the same subjects as first (Phase 2), third (Phase 3) and fifth (Phase 4) year teachers. As illustrated in the chart below:

Cycle 1	Phase 1	Phase 2		Phase 3		Phase 4	
Cycle 2		Phase 1	Phase 2		Phase 3		Phase 4
Cycle 3			Phase 1	Phase 2		Phase 3	
Cycle 4				Phase 1	Phase 2		Phase 3
	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978

[1] Sandefur, J.T., "An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates," A report prepared for the AACTE Commission on Standards., American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C. September, 1970.

Purposes

The purposes of this study were as follows:

1. Aid faculty and administrators concerned with teacher preparation in making decisions pertaining to curriculum evaluation and development.
2. Test the feasibility of conducting the evaluation model with the scope and complexity as suggested.

Methods and Procedures

The purpose of this section is to provide a detailed description of the prodecures followed in collecting the data utilized in this study.

Pre-Planning

Numerous preliminary planning sessions were held concerning the conduct of this study with the Dean and Assistant Deans of the College of Education and with Department Heads and various members of the Secondary and Elementary Education Departments. Support for the study and suggested procedures were solicited and obtained during these meetings. A time schedule was prepared to include deadlines for activities critical to the conduct of this study. This schedule was adhered to throughtout the study.

Additionally an advisory committee was selected by the researcher to aid in initial planning and to make recommendations concerning administrative details. This committee was composed of members from various departments within the College of Education. Especially helpful were faculty from the Counselor Education Department and School Administration Department. The Counselor Education Department provided expertise in the administration and interpretation of the F-scale. The School Administration Department provided valuable assistance in the project administration proceedings and initial contact with schools.

Selection of Subjects

The population for this study was defined as those student teachers who met the following criteria:

1. The student will enter practice teaching during the second bi-term of the spring semester.
2. The student plans to teach in Kentucky prior to graduation.
3. The student must have been a resident of Kentucky at least one year prior to entering Western Kentucky University.
4. The student must agree to voluntarily participate in this study.

Each prospective student teacher for the second bi-term for the spring semester was given a questionnaire containing the above four criteria. The majority of the questionnaires were distributed completed and collected at a meeting held for student teachers during the second week of the spring semester. At this meeting the purpose of the project and the items of the questionnaire were explained.

A stratified random sample of 40 students was obtained for the population defined by the above parameters. Stratification was based on type of teaching certificate sought. Twenty subjects for each strata, secondary and elementary education majors, were selected. A table of random numbers was used to ensure randomness.

Subjects for subsequent phases are comprised of those participants in Phase 1 who are employed as teachers in Kentucky. A questionnaire is sent to each participant of Phase 1 in September to obtain the information concerning the teaching status of the respondent.

Instruments

Instruments and records used for data collection consisted of five general types: a questionnaire, personality scale, rating scales, direct classroom observational systems, and transcripts of subject's grades. These instruments were selected on the basis of their (a) merit as a research tool, (b) contribution of the data obtained to the objectives of the study, (c) ease of administration, and (d) availability for obtaining the required data. In the following paragraphs a description of each instrument utilized will be given.

The Career Base Line Data Questionnarie was prepared by the researcher to obtain career base line data not readily available from other sources. Items were included that provided information concerning demographic data, professional data, and school and professional activities participation. "Fill-in-the-blank" and "check-the-appropriate-response" type of items were constructed to facilitate subject completion of the questionnarie.

A complete Transcript of Grades for each subject was obtained from the Registrar's Office at the end of the semester. Grade point averages(GPA) were computed for the subject's major(s), minor(s), professional education course work and total grade point average on a 4.0 scale. Their student teaching grades were recorded but were not included in the professional education GPA.

The F-Scale, forms 45 and 40 developed by Adorno and others, was the personality scale used to measure individual prejudices and antidemocratic tendencies. This 28 item scale refers to opinions regarding a number of social groups and issues about which some people agree and others disagree. Respondents rated each item on a scale for +3 to -3 but the scale was scored for coding purposes as shown:

+3 = strong support (coded 7)	-3 = strong support (coded 1)
+2 = moderate support (coded 6)	-2 = moderate support (coded 2)
+1 = slight support (coded 5)	-1 = slight support (coded 3)

Each subject's cooperating teacher during Phase 1 and the subject's administrator and peer teachers during subsequent phases, are asked to complete the Teacher Evaluation by Peer/Supervisor. This rating scale was derived from faculty evaluation forms designed at Kansas State Teacher's College. This form allowed for the subjects to be rated concerning three matters of administrative decisions and four areas of teacher behavior.

The Student Evaluation of Teaching(SET), developed by Veldman and Peck, was utilized to obtain ratings from pupils concerning five dimensions for teacher behavior. Veldmen describes these dimensions as friendly and cheerful; knowledgeable and poised; lively and interesting; firm control; non-directive. The SET enabled data to be obtained from pupils of subjects teaching grades

three and above if questions were read and explained by the proctor in the lower grades.

The Classroom Observation Record, developed by Ryans, was used to assess four dimensions of pupil behavior and eighteen dimensions of teacher behavior. Each dimension of pupil and teacher behavior was carefully described and defined in a glossary which accompanied the recording form. A seven scale interval was used to rate each of the pupil and teacher behavior. The observers circled the appropriate rating for each dimension immediately after each observation.

A 14 category Interaction Analysis System was utilized to record observed classroom behavior. This system was a combination of Flander's and Hough's systems if interaction analysis. Nine categories of teacher talk, two categories of student talk and three non-verbal categories were used by observers to record classroom behavior. The observer recorded a numerical value corresponding to a particular category every three seconds or every time the category changed. Thus, an objective record was obtained of the verbal interaction occurring the the classroom. Two 20 minute observations per subject were recorded. Frequencies for each category were tallied and ten measures of classroom behavior were obtained. Ratios were obtained for indirect to direct teaching, student talk to teacher talk, student questions to student response, silence to total, lecture to total, student talk to total, teacher talk to total, indirect to total, and direct to total.

Training of Observers

A team of four observers was utilized for data collection. An outside consultant was employed to conduct a concentrated three day training session approximately six weeks prior to collecting data. Additionally, bi-weekly practice sessions were held to improve techniques in use of the Classroom Observation Record and Interaction Analysis, Audio tape recordings, videotape recordings, films and live observations were utilized during the training period.

Reliability coefficients were computed at two week intervals to provide a progress check on inter-observer reliability. A final reliability check was made two days prior to the first scheduled observation. Specially selected audio tapes, video tapes and films were employed to determine observer reliability. The Scott coefficient was used to determine inter-observer reliability for a twenty-minute interaction analysis recording session. An inter-class correlation technique was used to determine the intercorrelation of ratings on the Classroom Observation Record. It was recommended that an inter-observer reliability coefficient for observational instruments be at least .75.

Collection of Data

Initial data were collected during a special meeting attended by the subjects. A detailed explaination of the procedures of the project was presented to the subjects and a question and answer period followed. During the presentation of procedures, it was stressed that all individuals' data would be kept in strict confidence. The initial data collection included the administration of Career Base Line Data Questionnaire and the F-Scale.

Administrators in the various school districts where the subjects were employed as teachers were made aware of the project and their permission was obtained for observers to enter the required classrooms. This was accomplished

with the help of four faculty members from the Department of School Administration within the College of Education. These contacts were made approximately two months prior to observers entering classrooms. The cooperating teachers in Phase 1 were also contacted prior to the observation of the student teachers to obtain their permisssion and explain the project to them. Tentative times were agreed upon when the student teacher would be in a teaching situation. During subsequent phases the teachers were contacted by telephone approximately two months prior to the planned visitation period.

During each phase two observations are made during the scheduled time period. Both observations are of the same class and at the same time of day. A twenty minute interaction analysis recording and ratings from the Classroom Observation Record are obtained at each observation. The observer begins the interaction analysis five to ten minutes after the class has started. The SET is administered during the second observation, during the last ten minutes of class time. The Teacher Evaluation by Peer/Supervisor is completed by cooperating teachers for Phase 1 and administrators and peer teachers for subsequent phases during the last observation period.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were computed from data obtained during each phase. Means, standard deviations and/or frequency counts were computed. Intercorrelation matrices for selected variables were established. These statistics were found for the total sample and also for the strata elementary and secondary subjects. Cycle 1 Phase 1 and Cycle 2 Phase 1 were also combined and descriptive statistics obtained.

A repeated measures design was used to measure any significant change in subjects from Cycle 1 Phases 1 and 2. An analysis of variance was done on Cycle 1 Phase 1 and Cycle 2 Phase 1 subjects to determine differences, if any, between the two groups.